

Date: Sat, 20 Aug 94 04:30:07 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #382
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Sat, 20 Aug 94 Volume 94 : Issue 382

Today's Topics:

20 m cw subband qrm
20 Meter CW subband QRM etc
CW ...IS NOW! (2 msgs)
looking for ethnic lists
Narrowband PCS Auctions
Scanner Freedom

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Fri, 19 Aug 94 10:14:27 -0500
From: news.delphi.com!usenet@uunet.uu.net
Subject: 20 m cw subband qrm
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

I received this from a friend and thought that it would be some good reading
for this group for a change. I know that this has had me pretty upset lately
and is in keeping with some of the threads in this group. Do not reply to ME
on this!!! I did not write it. I do agree that a solution should be in the
works, but which solution??

enjoy (wynn, this means you, friend)

pete, n1qdq

snip!

Subj: CQC Low Down Editorial

From: CQC@aol.com

X-Mailer: America Online Mailer

Message-Id: <9408181141.tn75345@aol.com>

To: qrp@Think.COM

Date: Thu, 18 Aug 94 11:41:34 EDT

Subject: CQC Low Down Editorial

Sender: owner-qrp@Think.COM

Precedence: bulk

+++The following editorial will appear in the next Colorado QRP Club newsletter, The Low Down to be mailed before the end of August:+++

Earlier this summer there was a posting on the QRP group on Internet about "20 meters shrinking." The concern was about the loss of the normal c.w. part of the bands to digital and other modes usually higher than 14.070. This is exactly what I have been talking about since the first of the year.

With the huge increase of new amateurs over the last few years, I am afraid that we will lose much of what has been the c.w. portion of the h.f. bands. Do you remember "gentlemen's agreements?" I have nothing against the various digital modes. Lots of QRPers use digital modes. However, I sincerely believe that many, possibly most, of the new amateurs are not aware of the gentlemen's agreements of the past. It is becoming quite common to hear many of them on 14.060 and down to 14.050 and sometimes even below.

The problem is that many of these stations are mostly automated and there is no way for them to hear our requests to QSY. Many of them admit they like the digital modes and do not operate any c.w. I'm not sure they would be able to copy us, if they were monitoring the frequency.

There has been a lot of talk lately about no-code privileges on h.f.

No-code privileges would mean an increase in s.s.b and digital modes. If this were ever approved, we would be forced out! Shear numbers would dictate this. Where would they go? Up? Heck no! Down? Sure. There is anntsduring major DX

operations. 3) Petition the FCC for a exclusive digital sub-band. Keep them contained! No digital outside this segment.

I would like to hear your ideas. I think something has to be done before it is too late. QRPers have the most to lose. Our opponents will have a lot of political clout as their numbers grow. I would also suggest that all of us join the ARRL. It is the only national amateur radio
o0

Date: Fri, 19 Aug 94 10:19:54 -0500
From: news.delphi.com!usenet@uunet.uu.net
Subject: 20 Meter CW subband QRM etc
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

I received this from a friend and thought that it would be some good reading for this group for a change. I know that this has had me pretty upset lately and is in keeping with some of the threads in this group. Do not reply to ME on this!!! I did not write it. I do agree that a solution should be in the works, but which solution??

enjoy (wynn, this means you, friend)

pete, n1qdd

snip!

Subj: CQC Low Down Editorial

From: CQC@aol.com
X-Mailer: America Online Mailer
Message-Id: <9408181141.tn75345@aol.com>
To: qrp@Think.COM
Date: Thu, 18 Aug 94 11:41:34 EDT
Subject: CQC Low Down Editorial
Sender: owner-qrp@Think.COM
Precedence: bulk

+++The following editorial will appear in the next Colorado QRP Club newsletter, The Low Down to be mailed before the end of August:+++

Earlier this summer there was a posting on the QRP group on Internet about "20 meters shrinking." The concern was about the loss of the normal c.w. part of the bands to digital and other modes usually higher than 14.070. This is exactly what I have been talking about since the first of the year.

With the huge increase of new amateurs over the last few years, I am afraid that we will lose much of what has been the c.w. portion of the h.f. bands. Do you remember "gentlemen's agreements?" I have nothing against the various digital modes. Lots of QRPers use digital modes. However, I sincerely believe that many, possibly most, of the new amateurs are not aware of the gentlemen's agreements of the past. It is becoming quite common to hear many of them on 14.060 and down to 14.050 and sometimes even below.

The problem is that many of these stations are mostly automated and there is no way for them to hear our requests to QSY. Many of them admit

they like the digital modes and do not operate any c.w. I'm not sure they would be able to copy us, if they were monitoring the frequency.

There has been a lot of talk lately about no-code privileges on h.f.

No-code privileges would mean an increase in s.s.b and digital modes. If this were ever approved, we would be forced out! Shear numbers would dictate this. Where would they go? Up? Heck no! Down? Sure. There is another 50 Khz above the Extra portion. They say that the c.w. mode is antiquated anyway. Right? Do you see what we could be in for?

If we don't stop the advancement of these operations into the regular c.w. portion of the band and especially the recognized QRP frequency, we will lose it. Many of the typical QRP receivers cannot handle a strong digital station at 14.062.

I have some suggestions. 1) Send a card to these operators notifying them that they are operating lower than the "gentlemen's agreement." If all of the QRP clubs would get behind this, it might make a difference. If we allow them to operate without opposition, they will claim "squatters rights."

2) Petition the FCC for an exclusive low-power c.w. sub-band for General and above. How about 00-10 Khz up on 80, 40, 20 and 15? Yes, reduce the Extra portion. The Extra portion is not fully utilized compared to the rest of the c.w. band. The first 10 Khz would reduce problems with QRM during major DX operations. 3) Petition the FCC for an exclusive digital sub-band. Keep them contained! No digital outside this segment.

I would like to hear your ideas. I think something has to be done before it is too late. QRPers have the most to lose. Our opponents will have a lot of political clout as their numbers grow. I would also suggest that all of us join the ARRL. It is the only national amateur radio organization and it does have a lot of clout with the FCC. We have to monitor what is going on there and be sure our supporters run for and are elected to posts as directors, etc.

72,

Rich High, W0HEP
President & Editor
Colorado QRP Club
The Low Down

+++ Your comments will be appreciated. Reply to: cqc@aol.com

Tnx, Rich, W0HEP

Date: 20 Aug 1994 07:01:49 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!darkstar.UCSC.EDU!news.hal.COM!olivea!
korie!newsworthy.West.Sun.COM!abyss.West.Sun.COM!usenet@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: CW ...IS NOW!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article 1@mhade.inhouse.compuserve.com, Peter Coffee WA20JL/AE

<72631.113@CompuServe.COM> writes:

>Lack of interest in Morse does not deny an individual access to HF spectrum.

>

>Proficiency in Morse, among other useful skills that support the purposes
>of the Amateur Radio Service, qualifies an individual for the privilege
>of such access. And privilege it is.

Go on back and read Part 97.1. Amateur Radio is a service, offering radio
privileges to people who further the goals of the US Amateur service. It
isn't some special honor bestowed upon the proven.

>It's like the infamous swimming requirement at MIT. No pass swimming,
>no pass the Physical Education requirement, no get your diploma. What
>does swimming have to do with nuclear engineering, or whatever? Nothing.
>They just hate the idea of going to all that trouble to train an individual
>who will drown the first time he falls into water over his head.

No, Morse code is not the swimming test of amateur radio. Please
read Part 97.1, and remember that trained CW operators were, at one time,
of value to the USA. That has to do with the "reserve of trained operators"
language in 97.1. Now, "trained operators" of value to the US know how to
operate Inmarsat terminals :-)

>In the same way, what a downer to have an individual who understands radio
>theory and regulations, but can't send a message under safety-of-life
>emergency conditions because the microphone broke.

This is a well-known and well-worn strawman. When was the last time you
knew someone who had to send a safety-of-life message but had a broken
microphone? What if it was the PTT switch that was broken, not the
mic element? This kind of scenario is contrived and unlikely.

>You want the privileges? You earn them by making yourself potentially useful
>under less than ideal conditions. Makes sense to me.

But that isn't what Part 97 says. Part 97 doesn't say people have to earn
licenses. Part 97.1 lays down the goals and purposes of amateur radio (in the
USA, of course) and says the rest of Part 97 is there to achieve them.

* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ, DoD#: j | Views expressed here are

*

* (310) 348-6043 | mine and do not necessarily *

* Dana.Myers@West.Sun.Com | reflect those of my employer

*

* "Sir, over there.... is that a man?"

*

Date: 20 Aug 1994 06:44:44 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!darkstar.UCSC.EDU!news.hal.COM!olivea!
korie!newsworthy.West.Sun.COM!abyss.West.Sun.COM!usenet@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: CW ...IS NOW!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article 2E50FF69@ornl.gov, wyn@ornl.gov (C. C. (Clay) Wynn, N4A0X) writes:
>In article <32qi54\$dn1@abyss.West.Sun.COM> myers@Eng.Sun.COM (Dana Myers)
writes:

>
>>Continuing to require knowledge of CW in the amateur service doesn't make
>>sense any more. People who want to learn CW will, and those who want to use
>>it will continue to use it (I know I will). But requiring everyone to learn
>>CW simply to gain access to HF doesn't make sense longer.
>
>I guess this is where we disagree. I think that any mode that is so pervasive,
>resilient, and ubiquitous as CW, a mode that is the basis for comparison of all
>of the other modes, a mode that, other than voice perhaps, is so easy to
>understand (I mean really understand, not just use) should be taught in all
>beginner and advanced amateur radio schools. Otherwise, the student is
>deprived of one of the most important basics. For instance, how can one carry
>on an intelligent conversation here without knowing which modes are more
>efficient or less efficient than Morse code keyed CW?

I must say I'm delighted to see this note, since it promises a constructive
dialog regarding the US Amateur Morse code requirements.

I've been saying that the Morse code requirement should be reviewed and
reformed because it does not serve the goals and purposes of the US Amateur
Service as outlined in 47 CFR Part 97.1.

Note, that I'm not saying Morse code is "bad" or worthless. I'm not suggesting
Morse code should be banned. I'm suggesting that it isn't as important as it
used to be. I'm going as far as to say that Morse code is not the basic
benchmark by which all other communications modes are judged. Frankly,
Morse code is much like the vacuum tubes were thirty years ago; being replaced
by newer, more attractive technology, still devoted fans resist the changes
and trumpet the advantages of the traditional technology. Just like
vacuum tubes. modern technology has rendered them obsolete in all but a
few special applications. Requiring people to demonstrate knowledge of
vacuum tubes is of little value to the amateur service today, and the tests
reflect so.

In all honesty, what is so appealing about Morse code? Well, it is a low
speed digital encoding method suited for learning and practice by humans.
Very little equipment is required to send and receive Morse code, with the

human brain acting as the data modulator/demodulator. The human mind even implements several techniques such as coherent detection and fuzzy recognition, making the mode resistant to variation is the sending speed and techniques of other operators.

However, the state of the radio has advanced far beyond where humans must make up for the inadequacies of the radio equipment. The Morse code requirement is a relic, though Morse code continues to have appeal to hobbyists.

* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ, DoD#: j | Views expressed here are

*

* (310) 348-6043 | mine and do not necessarily *

* Dana.Myers@West.Sun.Com | reflect those of my employer

*

* "Sir, over there.... is that a man?"

*

Date: 19 Aug 94 10:10:24 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: looking for ethnic lists
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

To whom it may concern:

I am looking for lists where social and political aspects of ethnic conflicts are dealing with. Could somebody advise me where I could find something of the kind?

Thank you in advance.

Yours, Dimitri Bayuk
International Laborotary VEGA,
Moscow.

dbayuk@comlab.msk.su

P.S. I am writing outside of your lists, so you would please answer me directly.

Date: Thu, 18 Aug 1994 09:50:28 MDT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!
nntp.cs.ubc.ca!alberta!ve6mgs!usenet@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Narrowband PCS Auctions
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

The FCC is moving fast in establishing the information superhighway through spectrum auctions. On August 17, 1994, the FCC released the following auction notification for Narrowband PCS:

FCC RELEASES NARROWBAND PCS RECONSIDERATION ORDER AND FURTHER NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULEMAKING

The Commission today released an order on reconsideration of its Third Report and Order (Third R&O) which established service-specific rules for competitive bidding for the award of narrowband PCS in the 900 MHz band.

The reconsideration builds on the successful completion of the first simultaneous multiple round auction of 10 nationwide narrowband PCS licenses. The Commission made minor changes to its auction rules and strengthened provisions designed to enhance opportunities for designated entities.

Auction Rules

The Commission retained the flexibility to release bidder identities. It will announce in advance of an auction by Public Notice whether it will release bidder identities. The Commission retained discretion to set suggested opening bids or minimum opening bids in order to speed the auction process. The Commission said it would defer until after the regional narrowband PCS auction a final decision concerning the auction design for the 12.5 kHz MTA and BTA paging response channels.

Designated Entity Provisions

The Commission took three steps to enhance the opportunities for designated entities to participate in the auctions and in the competitive provision of service.

Finally, the Commission issued a Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in which it indicated that it will consider whether "entrepreneurs' blocks" similar to those adopted for broadband PCS would be appropriate for promoting participation of designated entities in the remaining narrowband auctions. The Commission asked for comment on whether up to 4 MTA and 2 BTA licenses should be included in the plan, if it adopts an entrepreneurs' block. In addition, the Commission asked whether the BTA licenses should be licensed on a regional or national basis.

The Commission also asked for comment on the following

issues with respect to an entrepreneurs' block:

Whether bidding credits should be granted to small
licenses for a period of three years from the date of the license
grant; and whether, for a period of years after that, the Commission
should permit the licensee to assign or transfer control of its
authorization only to an entity that satisfies the entrepreneurs' blocks
entry criteria.

```
//----- Henry E. Crawford, Esq. -----//  
// LAW OFFICES OF HENRY E. CRAWFORD, 1150 Connecticut Avenue, N.W. //  
// Suite 900, Washington, D.C. 20036 //  
// Tel. (202) 862-4395 FAX (202) 659-3493 //  
//----- henryc@access.digex.net -----//
```

Date: 19 Aug 94 13:39:30 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: Scanner Freedom
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

>Heck, Is my point-at-the peak and push-the-mouse-button to
>demodulate spectrum analyzer illegal too? Guess all our
>test equipment must modified to exclude cellular! ;-))

kevin, i wouldn't be surprised to see someone decide to go after that stuff
too.

begins to read like Hogan's "Genesis Project" (i think that's right)...

folks that haven't been following the cell phone receiver ban got their wake
up call when radio shack pulled back a set of equipment recently -- compuserve
seems to have a fair number of "how can we stop them from banning our right to
have a scanner?" posts.

unfortunately, we don't have a wayback machine.

bill wb9ivr

Date: Fri, 19 Aug 1994 11:37:10 GMT
From: world!drt@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <4yDqwzmIhqX81Vol06a@msen.com>, <CunFLC.M8n@world.std.com>,
<081894045009Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>

Subject : Re: Let's kick this idea around...

Dan Pickersgill (dan@amcomp.com) wrote:

: drt@world.std.com (David R Tucker) writes:

: >I have to agree with this. The Canadian government got out of the
: >subband business, and the FCC should, too. There's no reason 80-10
: >can't be governed by bandplans like the rest of our spectrum. We can
: >manage. Let's find a voluntary place for digital stuff, if we have
: >to, the way we voluntarily find a place for 160 CW or 440 repeaters.
: >The system's more flexible and less bureaucratic.

: And just as much a part of Part 97 as it would become 'good operating
: practice'.

It sure would, and I wouldn't settle for less. But "good operating
practice" can change rapidly as the situation changes, but those rules
are cast in granite until we get the FCC to change them. It's just
easier to adapt to new needs and conditions. (Like, say, more digital
usage? Or, perhaps, in the event the Morse requirement is dropped and
cw usage falls? I would have thought you would have thought of that! :->)

-drt

David R. Tucker KG2S 8P9CL drt@world.std.com

Date: Fri, 19 Aug 1994 11:30:18 GMT

From: world!drt@uunet.uu.net

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <081194182202Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>, <CuJywr.LGn@world.std.com>,
<081894041704Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>

Subject : Re: Let's kick this idea around...

Dan Pickersgill (dan@amcomp.com) wrote:

: drt@world.std.com (David R Tucker) writes:

: >Dan Pickersgill (dan@amcomp.com) wrote:

: >

: >: Is it 'third party traffic' for ME to use an autopatch on the N8PKV

: >: repeater? It would be MY station talking to MY station and another party?

: >: Interesting.

: >

: >Is it third party traffic if you use a remotely controlled simplex

: >patch? Yup.

: I was not talking about the 'COMMON' interpretation of 'third party' but
: the one expressly defined in part 97. And no, I tend to think upon FIRST
: reading that the above situation is NOT third party traffic because it is
: not from one control operator to another control operator on behalf of a
: third party.

[deletions]

: But there is no 'another amateur station control operator (second party)'
: so this traffic does not fit the definition of 'third party
: communications' as set forth in part 97.3 (39), IMHO (upon first look).
: Unless the 'one' control operator counts as 2 as he is 'controlling' 2
: stations. I dunno...

That's my interpretation, because otherwise you have an unlicensed
party talking on an amateur rig but without 3d party restrictions,
which violated the intent of the rules, if not precise letter. That
"control op counts as 2" fudge makes it fit the definition, and I can
see the FCC using it if, say, the third party talked to a non-3d-party
country and that country complained. Plus, if the control op only
counts as one, he could be seen as enaging in 1-way transmissions,
which are usually illegal. I think I prefer fudge.

-drt

David R. Tucker KG2S 8P9CL drt@world.std.com

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #382
